Case 1:12-cv-01244-AJN Document 165 Filed 02/07/14 Page 1 of 2

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10019-6064

TELEPHONE (212) 373-3000

LLOYD K. GARRISON (1946-1991)
RANDOLPH E. PAUL (1946-1956)
SIMON H. RIFKIND (1950-1995)
LOUIS S. WEISS (1927-1950)
JOHN F. WHARTON (1927-1977)

writer's direct dial number 212-373-3218

WRITER'S DIRECT FACSIMILE 212-492-0218

writer's direct e-mail address dleffell@paulweiss.com

February 7, 2014

UNIT 3601, OFFICE TOWER A, BEIJING FORTUNE PLAZA
NO. 7 DONGSANHUAN ZHONGLU
CHAOYANG DISTRICT
BEIJING 100020
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
TELEPHONE (86-10) 5828-6300

12TH FLOOR, HONG KONG CLUB BUILDING 3A CHATER ROAD, CENTRAL HONG KONG TELEPHONE (852) 2846-0300

> ALDER CASTLE 10 NOBLE STREET LONDON EC2V 7JU, U.K. TELEPHONE (44 20) 7367 1600

FUKOKU SEIMEI BUILDING 2-2 UCHISAIWAICHO 2-CHOME CHIYODA-KU, TOKYO 100-0011, JAPAN TELEPHONE (81-3) 3597-8101

TORONTO-DOMINION CENTRE
77 KING STREET WEST, SUITE 3100
PO. BOX 226
TORONTO, ONTARIO M5K 1J3
TELEPHONE (416) 504-0520

2001 K STREET. NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1047 TELEPHONE (202) 223-7300

500 DELAWARE AVENUE, SUITE 200 POST OFFICE BOX 32 WILMINGTON, DE 19899-0032 TELEPHONE (302) 655-4410 MATTHEW W. ABBOTT
ALLAN J. ARFFA
ROBERT A. ATKINS
DAVID J. BALLGHMAN
LYNN B. BAYARD
DANIEL J. BELLGR
CRAIG A. BENSON
MITCHELL L. BERG
MARKES SERGMAN
BR CHRISTOPHER BOEHNING
ANGELO BONVINO
JAMES L. BROCHIN
RICHARD J. BRONSTEIN
DAVID W. BROWN
RICHARD J. BRONSTEIN
DAVID W. BROWN
RICHARD J. BROWN
JEANETTE K. CHAN
YVONNE Y. F. CHAN
YVONNE Y. F. CHAN
YVONNE Y. F. CHAN
LORD J. BROWN
J. F. CLAYTON
JAN J. CLAYTON
JAN J. CORNISH
CHRISTOPHER J. CUMMINGS
CHARLES E. DAVIDOW
DOUGLAS R. DAVIS
THOMAS V. DE LA BASTIDE III
ARIEL S. E. DESKE BAUM
ANDREW J. SEREY
ANDREW J. SEREY
ANDREW J. SEREY
ROSE A. FICE PINCH
ROSE A.

MEREDITH J. KANE
ROBERTA A. KAPLAN
BRAD S. KARP
PATRICK N. KARSNITZ
JOHN C. KENNEDY
G. AND C. KENNED
G. G. AND C. KENNED
G. G. KENNED
G.

*NOT ADMITTED TO THE NEW YORK BAR

By ECF

The Honorable Alison J. Nathan United States District Judge Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse 40 Foley Square New York, New York 10007

In re Harbinger Capital Partners Funds Investor Litigation, No. 12 Civ. 1244 (AJN)

Dear Judge Nathan:

This firm represents the Harbinger Defendants in the above-referenced action. We write to bring to the Court's attention Judge Sweet's recent decision in *SRM Global Master Fund Limited Partnership* v. *Bear Stearns Companies LLC*, No. 13 Civ. 2692, slip op. (RWS) (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 5, 2014) ("*SRM*"), which further supports the Harbinger Defendants' pending motion to dismiss the Sixth Amended Complaint. A copy of the decision in *SRM* is attached to this letter as Exhibit A.

The Harbinger Defendants seek dismissal of plaintiffs' common law fraud claim because (among other reasons) it is a "holder" claim that would require excessive speculation about causation and damages. (Dkt. No. 153 at 14-15.) Plaintiffs' opposition brief attempted to distinguish the Harbinger Defendants' authorities and asserted that "longstanding New York state precedent" allows their "holder" claim to proceed. (Dkt. No. 161 at 24.)

In SRM, Judge Sweet rejected a similar assertion by the plaintiff in that case, who had purchased Bear Stearns common stock and asserted claims for common law fraud under New York law based on "misrepresentations or omissions [that] caused [it] to retain ownership of securities that [it] acquired prior to the alleged wrongdoing." (Ex. A at 56.) In rejecting the SRM plaintiff's "holder" claims, Judge Sweet noted that the New York Court of Appeals "has not resolved whether New York law recognizes such a theory of fraud." (*Id.* at 57.) There—as here—the plaintiff was unable to identify any decisions from the Court of Appeals that specifically allowed "holder" claims in the securities context. Judge Sweet then ruled that given the "uncertainty" of New York law, the "most persuasive" view is that "New York does not recognize such claims," and he dismissed the SRM plaintiff's fraud claims on that basis. (Id. at 59.)

We submit that Judge Sweet's analysis of New York law in SRM further supports the dismissal of plaintiffs' fraud claim in this case. That claim should be dismissed for the reasons set forth in the SRM decision and for the reasons set forth in the Harbinger Defendants' opening and reply memoranda of law.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel J. Leffell

Enclosure

cc: All counsel of record (via email)